



Indiana Court Times

Supreme Court, Division of State Court Administration
www.state.in.us/judiciary/admin

Volume 10

Winter 2001

Number 1

Chief Justice Delivers State of Judiciary Speech

"Counsel, Computers, Compensation, and a Few Words About Dimpled Chads"

Indiana Chief Justice, Randall T. Shepard, delivered his State of the Judiciary Speech before the Indiana General Assembly on January 22, 2001. The following is a digest of the content. The full speech is posted on our website at www.state.in.us/judiciary.

In the last few days we have celebrated the peaceful transfer of the most powerful office in the world, and the largest inauguration in Indiana history.

These celebrations occur when we have seldom had it so good. I join the sentiment expressed by Governor O'Bannon that there is every reason to move forward building a better Indiana.

In that spirit, I come to report on the state of our judiciary. There are three areas where we need to focus: computers, counsel, and compensation, and then I'll say something about dimpled chads.

Courts and the Information Revolution

The central mission of the judicial system is finding truth, giving justice, and seeing that people get what they are entitled to. Carrying out these decisions makes for a lot of important paper.

We have made great progress in bringing order to this mountain of information. The people who rely on court information now have a better chance of finding and understanding court records.

Indiana's counties have spent millions bringing this material into the information age. But for all the money we have spent, our world does not work as efficiently as the credit card

industry. If a judge in Kokomo suspends the license of a drunk driver who hurts someone, and the police in Anderson stop him the following week, they may let him go because the order suspending the license frequently does not show up in the computer for weeks.

This occurs because there has never been any central coordination of the way court data is collected, displayed, and conveyed.

This cold reality, and its consequences, have led us to devise a strategy to correct these problems under the leadership of Justice Frank Sullivan and the Judicial Technology and Automation Committee.

There is an upside to moving ahead: judges will be able to tell when people who come to court owe tax money or fines, or if they are wanted.

We appreciate the willingness of Governor O'Bannon and the Budget Committee to recommend that we make an investment to remedy this situation. And we thank Chairman Bauer and Representative Cochran for including it in the budget bill.

Borrowing a famous phrase, my request is this: "Give us the tools, and

we will finish the job."

Lawyers for People Who are too Poor

There are no higher values in Indiana's courts than truth and justice under law. For more than a hundred years, Indiana has held to the ideal that in a decent society someone charged with a crime should not go to trial without a lawyer just because he or she is poor.

Of course, if this right of counsel is real, it must mean you have a lawyer with time and talent. A lack of quality representation in capital cases has brought some states embarrassing publicity.

But that story was not repeated in Indiana. Decisions of this legislature, this Supreme Court, this Governor and his predecessors, have created a model for indigent death penalty representation.

But the quieter and for most people more pertinent progress that Indiana has made relates not to the dozen capital cases a year but to the 280,000 felony and misdemeanor cases filed yearly. Many involve people who cannot afford a lawyer. During the last two years, officials in many counties have upgraded the quality of representation.

continued on page 2

State of the Judiciary Speech continued from page 1

This move to improve access to justice has never been popular and this advancement has cost money. But I think Hoosiers want people to have competent lawyers. Governor O'Bannon, the Budget Committee, and many legislators have made good on this commitment to the counties.

It will keep Indiana out of the headlines that have plagued other states and instead mark us as a place that works hard at doing justice for all.

Yes, Compensation

Even more than most organizations, courts depend on the talents and wisdom of two public officers at the heart of the legal system, judges and prosecutors.

Attracting and retaining qualified people requires that we offer remuneration sufficiently competitive with the private market.

For judges and prosecutors, the gap between the public and private sector has widened every year. This has not been the case anywhere else. During the last four years, private sector and public sector wages have grown at a respectable pace. But the only full-time employees in the state's workforce of over 35,000 who have not had a raise over the last four years are the judges and prosecutors. Our state, the fourteenth largest in the nation is 42nd in pay for trial judges.

This has made a difference in whom we can recruit. During the elections last fall, in eighty percent of the judicial races, one party or the other could not find a lawyer willing to take the office.

Competition from the private sector is a major reason. In Marion County, the principal law firms will pay Class of 2001 law grads about the same amount of money in their first year of work as we pay trial judges.

I believe that the political difficulty of dealing regularly with this task demands that we do what other states have done. We must create a mechanism that operates on an organized basis, functioning to make small inflationary adjustments in public salaries. The compensation commission bill passed twice last year by the Senate was a good way to do this. I support it completely, and urge the House to take it up this year.

And, Dimpled Chads

None of us have lived through such a period as the post-Presidential election weeks of 2000. This astounding national civics lesson emphasized the importance of voting and running a voting system that befits a great democracy.

Let me mention two things I make of our recent

experience. First, I took some pride in the fact that people deeply involved in Florida so often pointed to a state that seemed to have a better system: Indiana.

Indiana's reforms have not just positioned us better to deal with state-wide or multi-county election contests, they have also had a positive effect in individual counties last fall.

During a dramatic, historic moment — one of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices asked of the combating lawyers, "So, you think a system like Indiana's would pass constitutional muster?" and the lawyer responded, "It would be a fine start."

My other reaction was not so uplifting. As a judge, I wish it hadn't happened at all.

Judges hold the strong conviction that courts should have as little role as possible in the processes that lead to electing a President, or any other public official. These are democratic moments.

I know eleven of the sixteen members of the Florida Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court. I believe all wish those cases had never arrived because these cases inevitably produced predictions about how each judge might vote based on his or her party or the president or governor who made the appointment.

Surely it is true that all of those justices started someplace; indeed most judges started someplace. Justice Sherman Minton was a New Deal Democratic Senator, Chief Justice Richard Givan was a Republican member of this legislature in the 1960s, Justice Boehm and I both ran for office. A judge, they sometimes say, is a lawyer who once knew a governor. Fair enough.

The public expects that judges will hear and apply law and do justice regardless of who you are, what you're worth, or what party you belong to. Good judges do as much as human beings can to make good on that expectation.

And, really, when all the dust had settled, the members of the Florida Supreme Court had ruled twice for Mr. Bush and twice for Mr. Gore. And the Supreme Court in Washington issued its first decision by a unanimous vote and its second decision with five Republicans voting one way and two voting the opposite and with one of the Democrats voting with Bush on the applicable law. All were striving to do the best that mere mortals can to deliver justice under law for our country, putting personal preferences and party to one side.

This striving must command the allegiance of all members of the judiciary. I tell you that we will spend 2001 trying to make that happen in Indiana courtrooms.

New Statistical Information Needed in 2002 and New Weighted Caseload Study

During the fall Judicial Conference at French Lick, the Judicial Administration Committee of the Indiana Judicial Conference kicked off its new project, the update and refining of the Weighted Caseload Study.

In the first phase of the study, more than 200 judicial officers volunteered to participate by keeping time records of their activities. The second phase of the study entails a verification process during which Dr. Brian Vargas and staff from the Indiana University Public Opinion Lab will travel to counties and examine actual court records.

The project involves a reevaluation of the weights of many existing case types. Also, as a result of considerable input from trial judges, the Committee became convinced that a number of the case type categories are too broad and should be broken down in order to provide more accurate judicial time and case weights. As a result, the Committee recommended to the Supreme Court, and the Court approved, an amendment to Administrative Rule 8. The following new case type categories will be effective on January 1, 2002:

◆	Murder	MU
◆	Class A Felony	AF
◆	Class B Felony	BF
◆	Class C Felony	CF
◆	PC cases	PC
◆	Civil Collections	CC
◆	Mortgage Foreclosures	MF

1. The Former Criminal Felony now will be broken up.

2. Cases in which the Death Penalty or Life Without Parole is sought will not have a distinct case type designation but will be counted separately on the back of the report. The report will ask, "Of cases reported as being filed this quarter, in how many did the prosecution seek the **Death Penalty**? In how many did the prosecution seek **Life Without Parole**?"

Thus, Death Penalty cases and Life Without Parole cases will have to be counted and reported separately.

3. **Effective 1/1/2002, the CP category will still exist, but it will exclude Civil Collection cases - (CC) and Mortgage Foreclosure - (MF).**

4. **Civil Collection** cases will include: Proceeding supplemental as an independent action – this would include a foreign judgment being enforced as a proceeding supplemental, a

federal judgment being enforced or a judgment on restitution;

Lawsuits on notes and accounts;

General collection lawsuits – this would include actions by collection agencies, doctors, finance companies, hospitals, etc.

Any landlord – tenant lawsuits for collection or ejectment;

Tax warrants – where the Indiana Department of Revenue is a party.

Any action filed as a small claim is **EXCLUDED** from the Civil Collection category and will continue to be counted as a small claim, even if it includes collection, landlord-tenant disputes, etc.

5. **Mortgage Foreclosure – MF** will be another new case type category. It will include **cases in which a mortgage on real property is sought to be foreclosed.**

6. **PC – Petitions for Post Conviction relief. Presently, the Quarterly Case Status Report (QSR) calls for the number of PC cases, but PC is not a case type category under Administrative Rule 8. Under the present provisions, PC's are filed under the original Felony or Misdemeanor case. Many courts expressed difficulty in counting PC petitions because they are not issued separate case numbers. This persuaded the Committee to recommend to the Supreme Court that PC should be a separate cases type.**

Beginning in 2002, PC will be a separate case type category. **Thus, when a petition for post conviction relief is filed, it will receive a new PC case number. PC cases will not have a separate weight under the weighted caseload measures system and will still be included as a post judgment matter within the original criminal cases.**

7. **Deferred and Diverted cases** will be counted as disposed at the time they are diverted or deferred. **In addition to the new case type categories, the Supreme Court has approved a change in the method of case type disposition. Presently cases that are deferred or diverted through a prosecutorial diversion or deferral program remain on the court's "pending" count until the prosecutor moves to dismiss them or the defendant is brought back into the system and the case is disposed through some other method. This circumstance skews the court's statistics because the court has to**

Judicial Technology And Automation Committee



Moving the Indiana Justice System into the 21st Century

"We want to create a technology infrastructure that will enable the judicial system to be more efficient, responsive, and productive."

In order to develop a uniform policy on implementation of information technology by the Indiana judicial system, the Supreme Court of Indiana at the 1999 Indiana Judicial Conference formed a Judicial Technology and Automation Committee (JTAC) chaired by Justice Frank Sullivan, Jr. Other members of the committee include Judges Cynthia Ayers, Sherry L. Biddinger-Gregg, Christopher L. Burnham, Dean A. Colvin, Jeffery J. Dywan, Paul Mathias, Ted Najam, and Loretta H. Rush. The Committee's charge includes, but is not limited to, the development of a long-range strategy for technology and automation in Indiana's judicial system, including possible approaches for funding and implementation as well as the development of standards for judicial information case management systems, judicial data processing, electronic filing, deployment and use of judicial information on the Internet, and for all related technologies used in the courts. In short, the primary role of JTAC is to provide leadership and governance regarding the use of technology in the courts in an effort to better serve the people of Indiana.

In this regard, the Indiana Supreme Court recently requested that the General Assembly appropriate \$11.82 million for the FY 2001-2003 biennium to implement the "Judicial Technology and Automation Project." This request, if funded, will:

- Allow Indiana trial courts and court clerks to manage their caseloads faster and more cost-effectively.
- Provide users of Indiana trial court information, notably law enforcement

agencies, state policymakers and the public with more timely, accurate, and comprehensive information.

- Reduce the cost of trial court operations borne by Indiana counties.
- *Examine the feasibility of implementing important technological innovations in Indiana trial courts.*

JTAC is convinced that the Indiana judicial system must approach the future with a spirit of cooperation, vision, and enthusiasm. These three currents dictate that technology will make our judicial system better only if its development and applications are actively managed and that we receive the input and support from those who interact regularly with the judicial system. JTAC will provide the courts with a permanent forum in which to address the promise and the problems posed by modern communication and information technologies. It will also provide the important bridge between the judicial branch and the others involved in the "justice system."

Although there are over 400 separate courts in Indiana and 92 clerks, from the public's perspective there is but one judicial branch which encompasses trial and appellate judges, their immediate staffs, clerks' offices, executive and administrative operations, and other court personnel, such as court commissioners, interpreters, and reporters. And just beyond the boundaries of the judicial branch there are a large number of public agencies and private institutions that have regular, functional

interactions with the judicial system, such as the police, the Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV), departments of probation and correction, family and social service agencies, prosecutors and public defenders, and the private bar. Together, these other groups and the judicial branch are part of an overall "justice system."

Due to the autonomous nature of the various groups involved in this "justice system," historically there has been little uniformity or coordination on the use of technology among the groups. Moreover, due to the autonomous nature of the trial courts, there has not been much coordination within the judicial branch. Employment of court personnel, funding, use of technology and many

"...the technology infrastructure and e-services available to the Indiana judicial system lag far behind that of the private sector, other agencies in the state, and other courts across the nation."

aspects of court operations are handled and funded at the local level. As a result, court structures and court related services have varied widely from county to county. Not surprisingly, the technology infrastructure and e-services available to the Indiana judicial system lag far behind that of the private sector, other agencies in the state, and other courts across the nation.

In direct response to the fact of a lag, the growing public demand for access to judicial information, and the strong desire to improve, the Supreme Court of Indiana formed JTAC to help advance the appropriate use of technology by the Indiana judicial system. The purpose of JTAC is to provide leader-

continued on page 5

continued from page 4

...simply taking existing technologies and fully applying them to the practice of law and to the courts will give some indication of what we may realistically expect. Many of the current users of the judicial system will benefit.

ship in an area that has traditionally been without leadership. A long-term forecast of what is in store for the courts is nearly impossible. Information and communication technologies are changing too rapidly to make confident predictions more than a few years ahead. However, simply taking existing technologies and fully applying them to the practice of law and to the courts will give some indication of what we may realistically expect. Many of the current users of the judicial system will benefit. Most importantly, the people of Indiana will benefit. Their judicial system will use modern technology to improve efficiency, responsiveness and productivity. Areas of impact could include courtroom, case, juror, witness, attorney, and court scheduling; electronic filing, transfer, and real time multiple point access to pleadings and the case file; electronic recording of court proceedings; electronic maintenance and long term storage of court records; and development of management reports helpful to efficient allocation of resources and personnel.

JTAC is prepared to do what it takes to bring the Indiana judicial system into the 21st Century. We want to create a technology infrastructure that will enable the judicial system to be more efficient, responsive, and productive. The overall task of JTAC will be to create within the next five years a statewide court communications and information processing network to serve the "justice system" — courts, other state and local agencies, the general assembly, the bar, and the public. To the extent technically and economically feasible, creation of this statewide network will be accomplished by building upon information technology that is already in place and gradually migrating from existing systems. JTAC will encourage local initiatives within the context of statewide interconnectivity.

Since all the courts in the state will conform to a common set of standards, it will be possible to create a data warehouse of judicial information. The judicial information created by the court will be readily available to other state agencies such as the state police and the Bureau of Motor Vehicles. All dispositions will be reported and all license suspensions will be up-loaded in a timely fashion. Moreover, the central repository of information will allow querying and reporting on a level that is simply not possible today. This will allow the judiciary and the legislature to make informed policy decisions by having reliable and up-to-date information.

Of course, technology should not be viewed as a panacea for all of the woes of the judicial system. The temptation to

automate simply for the sake of automation must be resisted. Instead, applications of technology in court management should be assessed by determining whether they decrease time and labor associated with existing tasks, permit the cost-effective accomplishment of useful tasks not previously feasible, or permit elimination of unnecessary tasks. Technology should enhance productivity, reduce delay, or otherwise be more cost-effective than non-technical alternatives.

Technology must be perceived as useful and usable by its users, including many persons outside of the judicial branch, most significantly the bar and the general public. The extent to which a system is used will determine whether it is ultimately worthwhile. In order to properly evaluate progress, the committee must set objective, measurable goals to be reached within a reasonable period of time. Only by setting and measuring objective goals can the JTAC determine which technological projects should be promoted and which should be discarded. Without concrete goals, there could be a temptation to declare every technology project a success.

Only by engaging in a continuing process of reassessment and re-evaluation can the courts determine when technology has succeeded, failed to meet expectations, or been superseded by new developments. That reassessment and re-evaluation must be directed not only at the specific application of technology but also at the judicial system itself, since technological developments may create opportunities for re-engineering court operations, thereby improving the judicial process. In sum, the judiciary must remain technologically and operationally vigilant.

As we head down this path of modernizing our judicial system, JTAC seeks your input on how we should proceed. If you have a suggestion on how our courts can utilize technology better, please contact us. We are looking forward to working with all the constituents of our justice system as we move into the 21st century.

Kurt Snyder recently joined the staff of the Indiana Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration as the Director and Counsel of Trial Court Technology. In this capacity, he is the principal staff person for the Judicial Technology Automation Committee and the state's presence on the Internet. He also serves as an adjunct professor for the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University teaching business law and a course on business computer applications. ksnyder@courts.state.in.us

Judicial Technology And Automation Committee



UPDATE: JTAC - Internet Access and E-mail Initiative

The Judicial Technology and Automation Committee (JTAC) is making progress on its e-mail/Internet initiative. The committee's goal is to enable every judicial officer and elected clerk to have access to e-mail and to the Internet as soon as possible. Since the start of the project last October, approximately one hundred new

computers and forty-nine used computers have been delivered to Indiana's courts and clerks' offices. In addition, the committee has provided several thousand dollars to help pay for Internet service providers. As a result, scores of new judges and clerks now have e-mail and access to the Internet! Those of you who have been on the information highway

for some time, please encourage and help your colleagues in this endeavor. This project was made possible by federal grant funds obtained through the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.

If you are a judicial officer of a court of record or an elected clerk and you do not have e-mail, please contact Kurt Snyder at (317) 233-2778.

New Parenting Time Guidelines

Parenting Time Guidelines Adopted by Supreme Court

The Supreme Court of Indiana adopted Parenting Time Guidelines effective March 31, 2001. After two years of hard work, the Domestic Relations Committee of the Judicial Conference of Indiana submitted the guidelines to the Supreme Court.

The committee developed and used the results of three surveys with the assistance of the I.U. Public Opinion Laboratory. Judges, members of the Family Law Section of the Indiana State Bar Association, and mental health professionals who deal with children and families participated in the survey. Also, the committee received and reviewed numerous comments from

members of the public, advocacy groups, and experts in the area.

Indiana's Parenting Time Guidelines are based on the developmental stages of a child and are centered on the child. It is presumed they will be used in all cases, excluding family violence, substance abuse or situations that endanger the child. "Parenting Time" is the new term

used for visitation to emphasize the importance of the time the child spends with his/her parents. The guidelines cover communication, transportation, clothing, information exchange, holidays, distance concerns and other areas for infants, school age children and teenagers. Copies are available at the web site of the Supreme Court of Indiana at www.state.in.us/judiciary.

continued from page 3

report as pending cases in which there is no judicial action to be taken.

Beginning in 1/1/2002, the Quarterly Case Status Report, Part II, will be amended to reflect number of cases that have been placed on diversion or deferral during the quarter. The cases will be counted as "disposed by deferral" if they are infractions or "disposed by diversion" if they are criminal cases. As with cases that are counted as disposed due to Failure to Appear (FTA) or Failure to Pay (FTP), deferred and diverted cases which are counted as disposed cannot be counted again,

even if the defendant is prosecuted eventually.

8. Litigants without attorneys - **Changes to Narrative questions on QCSR.** Elsewhere in this issue the readers will note that Indiana has been awarded a grant to assess and assist pro se services in our courts. Trial judges and court staff report anecdotally a growing increase in the number of unrepresented litigants. We plan to capture information that would give us a more accurate assessment of the number of unrepresented litigants.

Beginning on 1/1/2002, the QCSR

will ask if one or both of the parties in each case type category is not represented by an attorney.

It is very important that all courts and clerks notify the case management program vendor of these changes immediately in order to give the vendors sufficient time to adjust each system systems. Questions about these changes should be directed to Lilia Judson, Rebecca Malott, or Lori Schumacher at 317-232-2542, or ljudson@courts.state.in.us, bmallott@courts.state.in.us, or lschumac@courts.state.in.us.

Commission Issues Advisory Opinion Affecting Part-time Judges

In November, 2000, the Indiana Commission on Judicial Qualifications issued Advisory Opinion #1-00.

The Advisory Opinion concluded that the Code of Judicial Conduct, which prohibits part-time judges from practicing law in their own courts, also prohibits them from practicing law in any division or courtroom of a unified court in which they serve as part-time judges. Judges whose courts or practices were affected by this decision were invited to contact the Commission within 30 days of the opinion to seek a reasonable extension of the rule's applicability. The opinion does not apply to pro tem judges.

The opinion also restated the rule that part-time judges may not practice law in any courts "subject to the appellate jurisdiction" of the courts on which the part-time judges serve. Therefore, as the Code always has provided, a part-time judge in a court in which appeals are filed, or to which requests for *de novo* review are filed, may not practice in those "lower" courts whose decisions might be reviewed by the part-time judge's court. The Commission also determined that these restrictions on the practices of part-time judges do not apply to partners and associates of part-time judges.

Call 317 232-4706 or write to mbabcock@courts.state.in.us for a copy of the opinion.

Special Projects and Committees

Pro Se Project and Committee

The Indiana Supreme Court was awarded a grant by the State Justice Institute for a statewide pro se office. A 15-member advisory committee will direct the project. The committee will include judges, circuit court clerks and legal services representatives. The project calls for a two-person office which would be within the Division of State Court Administration. One person will be paid with court and grant funds and one would be a VISTA volunteer. The office will initiate a pilot pro se project with the Legal Services Organization of Indiana in Monroe County. Developing uniform statewide court forms for use by pro se litigants would be an additional primary goal. Forms would also be translated into Spanish. Questions about this project should be directed to David Remondini at (317) 232-2550, Lilia Judson at (317) 232-2542, or Jane Seigel at (317) 232-1313 or e-mail at dremondi@courts.state.in.us, ljudson@courts.state.in.us, jseigel@courts.state.in.us.

Committee on Voice Recognition Technology

Last year, the Supreme Court formed an *ad hoc* committee of interested judges to study the advancements in voice recognition technology and its application to court reporting services. The **Hon. Dan Vanderpool**, Wabash Circuit, chairs the committee whose members included **Magistrate Hal Brueseke**, **St. Joseph Probate Court**, the **Hon. Terrance Cody**, **Floyd Circuit Court**, the **Hon. Stephen Heiman**, **Bartholomew Circuit Court**, the **Hon. Frederick Schurger**, **Adams Circuit Court**, and the **Hon. Jeffrey R. Smith**, **Carroll Superior Court**. The committee has already seen a demonstration by Audioscribe, a vendor that uses steno mask and voice recognition technology. The Missouri court administrator's office piloted Audioscribe in a project involving two court reporters. Within the next two months, the Committee will view a demonstration by Stenoscribe, another vendor using steno mask and voice recognition technology. This time, court reporters will also attend the session. Questions about this project may be directed to Andy Straw or Lilia Judson at (317) 232-2542 or ljudson@courts.state.in.us.

Committee on Local Rules

The Indiana Supreme Court Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure asked the Supreme Court to appoint a group of judges and lawyers to examine the local court rules of Indiana's courts and to recommend a model structure for such rules. The Supreme Court appointed the **Hon. Margaret Robb**, **Indiana Court of Appeals**, to chair the committee. The Local Rules Committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Rules Committee. The first step in this process will be a compilation of all existing local rules. Soon, all judges and clerks will receive a request from the committee for all local rules. Please do your best to compile your rules and provide them to the committee. Questions should be directed to Lilia Judson at (317) 232-2542 or e-mail at ljudson@courts.state.in.us.

Legal Motions

***Legal Motions** features personnel changes in the Indiana judiciary. If you have any news of retirements, resignations, new appointments, or people on the move, we would be happy to feature it.*

Appointment of New Judges:

Fulton Superior Court, The Hon. Wayne Steele, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Rosemary Burke.

Grant Superior Court 2, The Hon. Randall Johnson, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Thomas Wright.

Hancock Circuit Court, The Hon. Richard Culver, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Raymond Robak.

**Judge Culver was Superior Court 2 Judge.

Hancock Superior Court 2, The Hon. Jeanne M. Hamilton, effective 1/10/01. She replaces Judge Richard Culver.

Hendricks Superior Court 1, The Hon. Robert Freese, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Mary Lee Comer.

Jasper Superior Court 2, The Hon. Robert Monfort, Court abolished as of 10/27/00.

Jay Circuit Court, The Hon. Brian Hutchison, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Tom Diller.

Johnson Superior Court 1, The Hon. Kevin Barton, effective 10/1/00. He replaces Judge James Coachys.

Lake Superior Court, The Hon. Tom Stefaniak, effective 1/29/01. He replaces Judge James Clement.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Cynthia Ayers elected as presiding judge.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Becky Pierson-Treacy, effective 1/1/01. She replaces retiring Judge Taylor Baker.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Scherry K. Reid, effective 1/1/01. She replaces Judge David Shaheed.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Robert Altice, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge William Mercuri (pro-tem).

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Grant Hawkins, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Michael Jensen (pro-tem).

**Judge Jensen returned to Magistrate position

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. William Nelson, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge David Jester.

****Marion Superior Court**, Sr. Judge Richard Huston, pro-tem, effective 11/1/00. He replaces retiring Judge Susan Macey-Thompson.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Clark Rogers, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge David Hensel.

**Judge Rogers was juvenile magistrate.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. John Hanley, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge John Price.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Sheila Carlisle, effective 1/1/01. She replaces retiring Judge Ruth Reichard.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Mark Stoner, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge Richard Sallee.

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. William Young, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge Richard Huston (pro-tem).

Marion Superior Court, The Hon. Michael Keele, effective 1/1/01. He replaces retiring Judge Charles Wiles.

Morgan Circuit Court, The Hon. Matthew Hanson, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge F. Daniel Gettlefinger.

Newton Circuit Court, The Hon. Jeryl Leach, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge William Sammons.

Perry Circuit Court, The Hon. James McEntarfer, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge David Evrad.

Pike Circuit Court, The Hon. Lee F. Baker, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Marvin Stratton.

Pulaski Superior Court, The Hon. Patrick Blankenship, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Lisa Traylor-Wolf.

St. Joseph Superior, The Hon. Michael Scopelitis, effective 10/01/00. He replaces retiring Judge George Beamer.

Vanderburgh Superior, The Hon. Brett Niemeier, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Robert Lensing.

Vanderburgh Superior, The Hon. Mary Margaret Parkinson, effective 1/1/01. She replaces Judge Maurice O'Connor.

Warrick Superior Court, The Hon. Keith Meier, effective 1/1/01. He replaces Judge Edward Campbell.

New Courts For 2001

Marion Superior Court (Domestic Violence), 1/1/01. The Hon. Linda Brown presiding.

Cass Superior Court, 1/1/01 The Hon. Richard Maughmer presiding.

Elkhart Superior Court, 1/1/01 The Hon. David Bonfiglio presiding.

**Judge Bonfiglio was juvenile magistrate.

Tippecanoe Superior Court, 1/1/01 The Hon. Michael Morrissey presiding.

Pro-Tems

Parke Circuit Court John Lurton Asbury, effective 12/18/00 until March 31, 2001.

Appointment of New Magistrates:

Elkhart County, The Hon. Deborah Domine, 1/1/2001.

Johnson County, The Hon. Richard Tandy, effective 10/10/00.

Lake County, The Hon. Ellen Szarleta, effective 8/9/00.

Lake County, The Hon. Natalie Bokota, effective 10/23/00.

Termination of Magistrates:

Cass County, Robert Justice, 12/31/00, position abolished with establishment of new court.

Johnson County, The Hon. William Barrett, effective 10/9/00.

Lake County, T. Edward Page, effective 10/22/00.

Marion County: Diane Moore, 1/1/2001.

New Employees Join Staff at Division of State Court Administration

Andrew U.D. Straw, Statistical Analyst.

Andy Straw joined the Division of State Court Administration in August, 2000. He earned a B.A. in English and Philosophy (minor in Political Science), an M.S. in Language Education, and a Juris Doctor from Indiana University at Bloomington. Prior to joining the Division staff, Andy worked in Virginia for philanthropist Alan M. Voorhees on projects promoting excellence in state and local government. Foremost of these was an effort to automate all local government information related to land records in historic Richmond County. Andy was a member of the Virginia State Bar's Technology Task Force and co-chair of the Education of Bar and Bench subcommittee. Andy's spouse, Paola, is from Italy, and she teaches Chinese at IU-Bloomington while working on her Ph.D.

Teresa Christopher, Program Coordinator for the Office of GAL/CASA.

Teresa began her career as an Educational Specialist with the United States Air Force in 1982. In that capacity, she provided early education services to Air Force families and children stationed at Grissom AFB, Peru, Indiana. In 1994, she returned to college and graduated at the top of her class in 1997 with a Bachelor of Science Degree from Indiana University majoring in Criminal Justice and Psychology. She trained to become a CASA Volunteer in 1992, in Miami County and, in 1996, became Director of the Miami County CASA Program. She served in that capacity until July of 2000 when she became the Program Coordinator for the Indiana State Office

of GAL/CASA. In her current position, she works as a liaison for the State Office, providing support and training for Indiana's 71 CASA Programs.

Teresa and her husband Bill reside in Noblesville, Indiana. They have two sons, Ryan 14 and Aaron 6.

Teresa has served as Coordinator of the Miami County Child Protection Team, and President of the Miami County Chapter of the Child Abuse Prevention Council. She has also served on the Board of Directors for the American Cancer Society and Indiana Advocates for Children.

Chasity Thompson, Law Clerk for the Commission on Race and Gender Fairness.

Chasity, a native of Montgomery, AL, earned degrees in English and Business Administration and graduated Magna Cum Laude from Alabama State University and an M.B.A. from Auburn University. Chasity moved to Indiana to pursue a Juris Doctorate at Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis. She is the Student Representative on the Faculty Appointments Committee, a CLEO fellow, Indiana State Bar Association scholarship recipient, BLSA Vice-President, and she serves in various capacities with the Student Government Association.

During her undergraduate and graduate studies, Chasity worked on the school newspaper and as a Student Archivist at the Alabama Department of Archives and History. As an intern, she helped develop procedures for a new division at Fortune Magazine's "Best Company to Work For in 1998". In her current position, Chasity will conduct

research, organize and maintain the records of the commission, and generally provide support to the commission in carrying out its duties.

Committed to philanthropy, Chasity coordinated the Target Success Program, which encourages "at risk" youth to explore college and career options and expose them to more cultural and community service activities. She tutored at Shortridge Middle School and currently works with a weekend program designed to expose middle school students to law related fields and encourage personal growth and development.

Chasity is the daughter of Felton and Vera Thompson. She has one brother, Felton II, a sophomore in college.

Jana Matthews, Indiana CLEO Program Coordinator.

Jana Matthews is a recent graduate of Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis (JD '00) and a new admittee to the Indiana Bar. She has worked as a law clerk in the Division of State Court Administration since the summer of 1998, her first year in law school. Prior to attending law school, Jana obtained her BA in Political Science from Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio. During her law school studies, Jana was involved in the Association for Public Interest Law and the Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity, Inc. Jana is a member of the first class of Indiana CLEO fellows and has been an active participant and supporter of Indiana CLEO since its inception in 1997. As the Indiana CLEO Coordinator, Jana is responsible for enhancing the programs and services provided to the Indiana CLEO fellows.

In This Issue

State of Judiciary Speech	1 - 2
New Statistical Information Needed in 2002 and New Weighted Caseload Study	3 & 6
Judicial Technology and Automation Committee (JTAC)	
Moving the Indiana Justice System into the 21st Century	4 & 5
Update: JTAC—Internet Access and E-mail Initiative	6
New Parenting Time Guidelines	
Parenting Time Guidelines Adopted by Supreme Court	6
Commission Issues Advisory Opinion Affecting Part-time Judges	7
Special Projects and Committees	7
Pro Se Project and Committee	
Committee on Voice Recognition Technology	
Committee on Local Rules	
Legal Motions	8
Judicial Appointments	
New Courts for 2001	
New Employees Join Staff at Division of State Court Administration	9
Andrew U.D. Straw, Statistical Analyst	
Teresa Christopher, Program Coordinator for the Office of GAL/CASA.	
Chasity Thompson, Law Clerk for the Commission on Race and Gender Fairness	
Jana Matthews, Indiana CLEO Program Coordinator	

Indiana Court Times

Division of State Court Administration
115 W Washington ST STE 1080
Indianapolis IN 46204-3466

Our goal is to foster communications, respond to concerns, and contribute to the spirit and pride that encompasses the work of all members of the judiciary around the state. We welcome your comments, suggestions and news. If you have an article, advertisement, announcement, or particular issue you would like to see in our publication, please contact us.

If you would like to receive this newsletter via e-mail, or by accessing our website, please send a message to dguthrie@courts.state.in.us to have your name added to our electronic list and removed from our hardcopy mailing list.

Editorial Board

Lilia G. Judson, Executive Director
Meg Babcock, Counsel
Deborah Guthrie-Jones, Production Coordinator

Contributors: Meg Babcock, Jeff Bercovitz, Lilia Judson, Dave Remondini, Kurt Snyder.

Please Circulate to Co-workers

This newsletter reports on important administrative matters. For future reference, add it to your Trial Court Administrative Manual.